

### REMARKS

Claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-24. Claims 3, 5, 8, 11, 13, 16, 19, 21 and 24 have been amended. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

### OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS

The Office Action has objected to the drawings because of reference character '565' being used for both a link barrier and link interface on page 8, line 35, of the instant specification. The figure being referenced is Figure 1 of the instant specification.

Applicants respectfully traverse. Applicants have examined Figure 1 and have found that no double labeling exists. However, Applicants have found that the specification contains an erroneously referenced character. Applicants have appropriately amended the instant specification to correct erroneous labeling.

Further, the Office Action has requested that Applicants include short and descriptive labeling for the reference characters within Figure 1.

Accordingly, Applicants have appropriately amended Figure 1 to comply with Examiner's request.

A replacement sheet for Figure 1 is attached herewith.

### IN THE SPECIFICATION

Please replace the fifth paragraph on page 8, which continues on page 9, with the following paragraph.

Also shown in Figure 1 is link barrier 565, which, in one embodiment, is an integrated circuit chip which is integrated within a link interface, e.g., link interface 165. In one embodiment, link barrier 565 is an ASIC (application specific integrated circuit) chip, such as a Sakura chip, developed by Hewlett-Packard Company of Cupertino, California. It is appreciated that for descriptive purposes of the functions and disposition of the link barrier, embodiments of the present invention will be described in the context of link barrier 565 as shown disposed within link interface 165. However, it is appreciated that to provide for proper protection within network 100, an analogous link barrier, e.g., link barrier 555, 575, and 585, respectively, are disposed in each of the other link interfaces, e.g., link interfaces 155, 175, and 185. When inactive, link barrier 565 is, in one embodiment, configured to allow data transmissions from one domain, e.g., domain 101, to another domain, e.g., domain 102. When activated, link barrier 565 is configured to block or prevent further data communication from one domain to another. Link barrier 565 is activated when data errors are observed/detected within a link interface, e.g., link interface 165.

Please replace the second complete paragraph on page 9 with the following paragraph.

It is appreciated that in another embodiment, link barrier 565 may be implemented as a stand-alone link barrier implemented in a node, e.g., node 160, and not disposed within a link interface. It is further appreciated that in another embodiment, a link barrier, e.g., link barrier 565 can be implemented in nearly any configuration comprised of intercommunicating electronic devices. It is appreciated that link interfaces 155, 165, 175, and 185 can be ATM switches, smart hubs, routers, bridges, and the like.

## CLAIM REJECTIONS

### 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, 15-17, 19-21, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Neal, et al., United States Patent Number 6,766,467.

The rejection is respectfully traversed, for the reasons below. It is respectfully submitted that 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, 15-17, 19-21, 23 and 24 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Neal, for the rationale presented below.

Claim 1 recites:

A method of error protection comprising:  
detecting an error during communication between nodes in a network, said nodes separated by a link;  
blocking further communication between said nodes in response to said detected error; and  
unblocking said blocked communication between said nodes, provided said communicating nodes have resolved said detected error, wherein said communication between said nodes is re-enabled.

The claimed embodiment, as required in Claim 1, recites a method of error protection consisting of detecting an error during communication between nodes and blocking further communication between the nodes until the detected error is resolved.

Therefore, as claimed, until a detected error is resolved, further communication between nodes is blocked upon detection of an error during communication between nodes.

Neal, in contrast to the claimed embodiments, discloses pausing a send queue. Neal, as understood by Applicants, suggests placing a send work queue in an error state, e.g., pauses the send work queue, when a data error occurs in the send work queue. As further understood by Applicant's, Neal further suggests no other send work queues are placed in an error state. Continuing, Neal, as understood by Applicants, suggests that the send work queue experiencing the error is not able to send any further messages. (Abstract) However, as suggested by Neal, other work queues continue to be able to send and/or receive messages. (See Col. 2, lines 26-34; Col. 10, lines 9-22; Col. 11, lines 6-7; Col. 11, lines 15-21; Col. 11, lines 30-39; Claim 1, second element; Claim 9, second element; Claim 17, second element and Claim 25, second element.)

Thus, as understood by Applicants, Neal specifically discloses blocking only the send work queue when an error is detected and permits other communication from other work queues. As understood by Applicants, Neal does not suggest, teach or describe blocking communication between nodes, only blocking the send work queue associated with the detected error.

Neal, as understood by Applicants, does not describe the claimed limitation of "blocking further communication between said nodes in response to said detected error." as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the cited reference does not suggest, teach or describe the claimed embodiments of Claim 1 for the above reasons.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere in the Neal reference does Neal show, suggest, teach or describe blocking communication between nodes upon detection of an error, as required in the claimed limitations.

Thus, Neal does not teach the claimed limitation of "blocking further communication between nodes in response to said detected error" as required in Claim 1. In fact, Neal, as understood by Applicants, describes provisions for allowing communication with other work queues that are not associated with the detected error, which teaches away from Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by Neal. As Claims 9 and 17 contain similar limitations, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 9 and Claim 17 are not anticipated by Neal.

Continuing, Claims 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 depend from Claim 1. As Claim 1 is believed to be allowable, rejected Claims 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 are not anticipated by Neal. Claims 11, 12, 13, 15 and 16 depend from Claim 9. As Claim 9 is believed to be allowable, rejected Claims 11, 12, 13, 15 are not anticipated by Neal. Claims 19, 20, 21, 23 and 24 depend

from Claim 17. As Claim 17 is believed to be allowable, rejected Claims 19, 20, 21, 23 and 24 are not anticipated by Neal. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, 15-17, 19-21, 23 and 24 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Neal.

Allowance of Claims 1-24 is earnestly solicited.


### CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims is requested. Based on the arguments and amendments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, 15-17, 19-21, 23 and 24 overcome the rejections of record and therefore, allowance of Claims 1-24 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,  
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 11/11, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John P. Wagner  
Registration No. 35,398

Address: WAGNER, MURABITO, & HAO LLP  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
Telephone: (408) 938-9060 Voice  
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile